of twelve with the year. The assonance *balivarda : parivatsara* would of course assist, and perhaps also a similar assonance between *iluvarda* and *idāvatsara* (*iduvatsara*), the third year of the five-year cycle. Burrow has shown (*Trans. of the Philological Society*, 1946, p. 25) that Skt. *lāṅgala* " plough " may have been borrowed from Dravidian (ultimately from Austro-Asiatic), and it is natural to look to the same source for the name of the ploughing ox. We may thus recognize in *balivarda* the Dravidian *vali-* " to drag ". (For the initial, cf. Skt. *bala* : Drav. *val*, Burrow, ibid., p. 19.) It is tempting to assume that *iluvarda* also means a kind of draught-animal, in which case one could compare Drav. *iṛu-*, also meaning " to pull, draw ". (Drav. *ṛ* > Skt. *l* is well established, cf. *kāṛ : kāla, tāṛ : tāla*, Burrow, ibid.) This suggestion is put forward with some diffidence, but with the feeling that it may be worth considering further before too hastily accepting a Middle Indian etymology for these two words.

3.9.16.2. After " Thou art an overlord ", insert " Make me an overlord ".

J. BROUGH.

THE EPIGRAMS ATTRIBUTED TO BHARTṚHARI. Critically edited by D. D. KOSAMBI. pp. viii, 81, 240. Bombay, 1948. (Singhi Jain Series, No. 23.)

Although the Centuries of Bhartṛhari are among the most popular of Sanskrit literary works they have not hitherto been served by an adequate critical edition. The editorial problem is peculiarly complex, since the work exists in such widely divergent recensions. Professor Kosambi has now provided us with an edition which is, indeed, a new departure in Indian textual criticism. An examination of a vast quantity of the manuscripts (377, including fragments) has enabled him to sort them into two main recensions, a Northern and a Southern, each subdivided into two " archetypes ", which again split into twelve main " versions ", though the analysis is complicated by constant conflation, even between representatives of the two main recensions. As a preliminary to the present edition, Professor Kosambi has previously published his reconstruction of the Southern recension (Bhāratīya Vidyā Series, No. 9, Bombay, 1946), which has rearranged the stanzas in groups according to subject-matter. An important point for the history of the text is the proof (Introduction, p. 63) that the Southern recension is descended from a single defective manuscript.

In view of the nature of the material it is not, of course, possible to arrive at an original text-order. In the case of individual stanzas, however, the situation is very much better, and here the editor's collations have enabled him to abolish numerous faulty readings and to constitute a text which, although he himself makes no claim to finality, is considerably superior to any previous edition. The stanzas are presented in four groups, in order of decreasing probability. Group I contains the 200 stanzas found in all the well-defined versions, and hence almost certainly original. These are given in the traditional classification into Nīti, Śṛngāra, and Vairāgya. Group II contains all other

stanzas occurring in more than one of the well-determined versions, and group III stanzas from *Śatakatraya* manuscripts not belonging to groups I or II. This group has therefore scant probability of being genuine. For the sake of completeness a fourth group is added, containing the apocryphal works *Viṭavṛtta* and *Vijñānaśataka*. The criterion adopted is thus the objective one of the strength of manuscript support; but it is of interest to note that the average literary quality of the verses appears to decrease markedly from one group to the next. This would certainly support the view that the nucleus round which the versions grew was, in fact, the work of a single author, who was not an anthologist, as has sometimes been suggested, but a poet of considerable stature. Professor Kosambi believes, however, that the collection and arrangement of his verses into the three śatakas is the work of a subsequent generation, and there is nothing inherently improbable in this view.

One point which may prove of interest for the editing of other classical Sanskrit poets is the editor's contention that Bhartṛhari on occasion permitted himself a hiatus within the verse—that is, a breach of the normal rules of sandhi, since " permissible hiatus " as in *samastā ime* (25) need cause no concern. (*Śūre nirghṛṇatā ṛjau vimatitā* in 24 is not really " permissible ", though there is admittedly a break in the sense.) Even where the hiatus is permissible, however, there is a tendency among scribes to eliminate it by the insertion of superfluous particles and the evidence for an original hiatus is frequently the profusion of different methods of filling the gap. Thus, in 71, where the manuscripts have *vidvajjane cārjavam, v. 'py ārjavam, v. tv ārjavam, vidvajjaneṣv ārjavam, vidvajjanasyārjavam*, the editor concludes that the original reading must have been *vidvajjane ārjavaṃ*. This may be here a correct conclusion, but in such cases two alternative possibilities must be kept in mind: first, that the ungrammatical hiatus may have arisen by corruption in the archetype, and not be due to the author: and second, that one of the particles may, in fact, be correct, and that the substitution of one for another, where neither contributes to the meaning, may be due simply to the scribe writing partly from memory. The instances of hiatus most likely to be correct are those between lines *a* and *b* or *c* and *d* of the stanza, as in 15, where the inserted particles of the manuscripts are particularly clumsy. It should, however, be noted that there are usually additional factors to justify a hiatus. Thus, *akṣamī/ā jñātaṃ*, 249, *c*, *d*, where *āḥ* not only begins a line and a sentence, but as an exclamatory particle has special privileges of its own. Similarly, *nirghṛṇatā* and *ṛjau*, in 24, are separated by the comma between two items of a catalogue, and *ṛ* has presumably quite early acquired a pronunciation as consonant plus vowel. (Cf. also *suralokaṛddhi* 310.) In *vidvajjane ārjavam* 71, and *prārabhya uttamaguṇāḥ* 277 we have likewise items in a catalogue, and the reading with hiatus is supported by the parallel items in the same verse. The undoubtedly correct 311*d*, *dhik tāṃ ca taṃ ca madanaṃ ca imāṃ ca māṃ ca* (supported by most of the manuscripts) is also an enumeration, and in *paragṛhe āśankayā* 148, the second word (separated by the cæsura) begins the apodosis in one of three successive pairs

of antithetical clauses. Where, however, the hiatus is neither at the end of a pāda, nor at a sense-pause between a list of phrases, nor between the two members of an antithesis, the probabilities are much less. The suggested emendation in 86, *ko vā arthaiḥ*, lacks this support, and seems to me unlikely. Neglecting minor variants and occasional conflation, the Northern recension here has *ko vāpy arthaiḥ*, as against the Southern *ko vārtho 'rthaiḥ*. The Northern reading is unobjectionable, and could very easily have given rise by misreading to, say, *ko vātharthaiḥ*, whence by scribal emendation the Southern reading, with the consequent change of the last word in the line from *sānurāgaḥ* to *sānurāge*. Professor Kosambi has made out a good case for most of the hiatus restored to the text; but the considerations given above are a warning against too lightly assuming its occurrence in editing other poets.

J. Brough.

Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse, de Nāgārjuna. (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra.) Par Étienne Lamotte. Tomes I, II. pp. xxxii, 1118. (Bibliothèque du Muséon, vol. 18.) Louvain, 1944, 1949.

In these volumes Professor Lamotte continues his important work of translating from the Chinese versions Buddhist texts of which the Sanskrit original is lost. The *Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra* (Mppś) is a detailed commentary on the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*. This latter appears in four Chinese versions, one of which (Introd., p. viii) has for its title in Chinese transcription *Mahā-prajñāpāramitāsūtra*. The present work is therefore a " Treatise on the Great Prajñāpāramitā(-sūtra) ", and not what the Sanskrit reconstruction of the title at first sight seems to suggest a " Great Treatise on Prajñāpāramitā ", and still less, of course, the " Treatise on the Great Pāramitā of wisdom " into which the French rendering may entrap the unwary. The Mppś was translated into Chinese at the beginning of the fifth century A.D., and it is attributed by Chinese tradition to Nāgārjuna. On the other hand, it is not known to the Tibetan tradition. It would, of course, be a matter of great interest if it were in fact the work of the author of the *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās*. Professor Lamotte is somewhat non-committal in his introduction on the question of the attribution, merely mentioning the name of the Mādhyamika philosopher and adding that there was another author of the same name known as a composer of Tantras; and it is in any case clear that so famous a name would easily be attached to the most diverse compositions. In a note, however, on p. 140, the identification would seem to be accepted without question, in spite of the fact that the note concerns a difference in view (admittedly a minor one) between the *Madhyamakaśāstra* and the Mppś. On pp. 614 and 734 further differences are noted and in the latter place Professor Lamotte appears to leave the question open. At present it would seem that the attribution remains doubtful, though further study of the work may perhaps decide the matter.